



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RAF
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,220	03/22/2004	Kazunari Yamaguchi	Q80490	9623
23373	7590	11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			CHEN, STACY BROWN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,220	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stacy B. Chen	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/22/04; 9/22/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I on September 8, 2005 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 8-10 are withdrawn from consideration being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-7 and 11-16 are under examination.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the sentence structure is incomprehensible. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While all of the technical details of a method need not be recited, the claims should include enough information to clearly and accurately describe the invention and how it is to be practiced. The minimum requirements for method steps minimally include a contacting step in which the reaction of the sample with the reagents necessary for the

assay is recited, a detection step in which the reaction steps are quantified or visualized, and a correlation step describing how the results of the assay allow for the determination.

In this instance, the claims are drawn to methods for detecting antibodies by detecting antibodies. The method steps instantly recited do not convey enough information to clearly claim Applicant's invention. The methods require further steps to explain how the detection of antibodies is performed. In summary, either the method steps need to be expanded upon or the preamble of the claims needs to be modified to match the method steps. Correction is required to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi *et al.* (*Annals of Clinical Biochemistry*, July 2001, vol. 38, pages 348-355, “Yamaguchi”). The claims are drawn to a method for detecting IgM and/or IgG antibodies to an antigen, specifically a Borna disease virus (BDV) polypeptide from the p24 (SEQ ID NO: 1) and/or p40 (SEQ ID NO: 3) region. The detection is performed via an immune agglutination reaction method, such as a fine particle counting immunoassay method.

Yamaguchi discloses a synthetic peptide-based electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA) for anti-BDV p40 and p24 antibodies in rat and horse serum. Yamaguchi teaches the

synthesis of 13 peptides having hydrophilic BDV p40 and p24 sequences that were fixed into microbeads. Table 1 discloses a p40 peptide that is identical to Applicant's SEQ ID NO: 3 (PKRRLVDDADAMEDQDLY), and a p24 peptide that is identical to Applicant's SEQ ID NO: 1 (QPVDQLLKDLRKNPS). Rabbit anti-BDV p40 or p24 antiserum was detected by ECLIA immunoassay. ECLIA assay involves the use of an electrode and measurement of photons emitted from the secondary antibodies bound to the BDV antibody-antigen complexes (page 350, first column). The ECLIA method is an immune agglutination reaction method (antigen-antibody binding), and is a fine particle counting method (electrode-photon). Regarding the limitations of detecting IgM and IgG, the antibodies that bind to BDV antigens are expected to be IgM and IgG. IgG is the most prevalent immunoglobulin that responds to antigens. IgM, while not as prevalent as IgG, is also involved in responding to antigens and is also involved in the complement cascade.

Given the teachings of Yamaguchi, the claims are clearly anticipated.

Duty to Disclose

5. Applicant is reminded that they have a duty to disclose information material to the patentability of the claims. In the instant case, the Yamaguchi reference was authored by at least one of the inventors named on this application. It does not appear that Applicant cited this reference on any PTO-1449 for the examiner to consider.

37 CFR 1.56 Duty to disclose information material to patentability.

A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclose information exists

with respect to each pending claim until the claim is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application. There is no duty to submit information which is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by § 1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:

- (1) Prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and
- (2) The closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.

Conclusion

6. No claim is allowed.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacy B. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-0896. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James C. Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Stacy B. Chen
November 16, 2005